

EXHIBIT E

First Judicial District of Pennsylvania

171101173
Seal Vs. Seal

Trial (Waiver) Volume 6
November 01, 2019



First Judicial District of Pennsylvania
100 South Broad Street, Second Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19110
(215) 683-8000 FAX:(215) 683-8005

Original File 11-01-2019.txt, 263 Pages
CRS Catalog ID: 20010332

171101173
Seal Vs. Seal

[1] IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
CIVIL TRIAL DIVISION
[2]
[3] ---
[4]
[5] SIMONE A. SEAL : NOVEMBER TERM, 2017
[6] : NO: 01173
[7] vs.
[8] a
[9] RIMA VANHILL-SEAL and :
RONALD T. SEAL :
[10] ---
[11] :
[12] vs.
[13] SIMONE A. SEAL and :
[14] MATTHEW PEARSON :
[15] City Hall
Room 246
[16] Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
[17] :
[18] November 1, 2019
[19] :
[20] Trial
[21] ---
[22] BEFORE: THE HONORABLE GLYNNIS HILL
[23]
[24]
[25] ---
Jacqueline Froncek,
Official Court Reporter

Page 1

Page 2

[1] APPEARANCES:

- [2]
[3] Stuard Winegrad, Esquire
-- For Simone Seal
[4]
[5] Nicholas Poduslenko, Esquire
-- For Ronald Seal and Rima Vanhill Seal
[6]
[7] Jonathan Sobel, Esquire
-- For Matthew Pearson
[8]
[9]
[10]
[11]
[12]
[13]
[14]
[15]
[16]
[17]
[18]
[19]
[20]
[21]
[22]
[23]
[24]
[25]

Page 3

Page 4

	INDEX	PAGE
[1]	---	
[2]	INDEX	
[3]	---	
[4] WITNESS:		
[5] RIMA VANHILL SEAL		
[6] By Mr. Poduslenko	5	
By Mr. Winegrad	57	
[7] By Mr. Sobel	74	
By Mr. Poduslenko	120	
[8] By Mr. Winegrad	123	
By Mr. Sobel	126	
[9]		
[10] MATTHEW PEARSON		
[11] By Mr. Poduslenko	132	
By Mr. Sobel	197	
[12] By Mr. Poduslenko	210	
[13] RONALD THOMAS SEAL		
[14] By Mr. Poduslenko	216	
By Mr. Winegrad	222	
[15] By Mr. Sobel	225	
[16] SIMONE SEAL		
[17] By Mr. Winegrad	240	
[18]		
[19]		
[20]		
[21]		
[22]		
[23]		
[24]		
[25]		

- [1] **THE COURT:** Counsel, if we could re-call --
[2] **MR. PODUSLENKO:** It was Rima Seal.
[3] **THE COURT:** Counsel, you were about to cross,
[4] I believe.
[5] **MR. PODUSLENKO:** No. I had to finish my
[6] direct.
[7] **THE COURT:** Okay. Thank you.
[8] **MR. PODUSLENKO:** And, Your Honor, if
[9] permitted, I spoke to Mr. Winegrad, I think we would all
[10] like to finish this today.
[11] **THE COURT:** We have to. I have another case
[12] Monday.
[13] **MR. PODUSLENKO:** There are a number of texts
[14] and other social media things. What I would like to do is
[15] point to it, ask her to identify what it is, read it, and
[16] ask her what --
[17] **THE COURT:** That is fine. I am going to
[18] allow you -- all the parties, actually, a little
[19] opportunity to lead today so we can get through this.
[20] **MR. SOBEL:** Judge, can I make a request?
[21] **THE COURT:** Sure.
[22] **MR. SOBEL:** Would it be possible if we took
[23] our morning break at around 11:00, so I can make a
[24] conference call?
[25] **THE COURT:** So you need about five minutes?

Page 177

Page 178

[1] **THE WITNESS:** Yup.[2] **BY MR. PODUSLENKO:**[3] **Q.** Again, these are more texts that you sent,
[4] correct?[5] **A.** Correct.[6] **Q.** And this would have been after the lawsuit was
[7] filed, correct?[8] **A.** Incorrect.[9] **Q.** Incorrect?[10] **A.** Sorry --[11] **Q.** When did you send the texts, sir?[12] **A.** Sorry. Which lawsuit do you mean? The lawsuit
[13] that she filed? Or the lawsuit that was filed against us?[14] **Q.** The lawsuit that was filed against you.[15] **A.** No. Incorrect.[16] **Q.** All right. Was this before or after the lawsuit
[17] she filed?[18] **A.** I don't know. It doesn't have a time. I don't
[19] know.[20] **Q.** And you didn't produce any texts as part of this
[21] case despite us asking for them, correct?[22] **A.** I was not aware I was being asked for texts. You
[23] have all the texts.[24] **Q.** You were not aware that we submitted a request
[25] for documents to your attorney?[1] **A.** Kristin Fromosa.[2] **Q.** And it says, "And your uncle isn't innocent
[3] either. He lied to Simone about adopting her, and she had
[4] to find out at the courthouse. And your uncle committed
[5] tax fraud it seemed, hoping Rima collects Simone's money."[6] What evidence do you have today that Ron
[7] committed tax fraud?[8] **A.** I don't.[9] **Q.** Pardon me?[10] **A.** I don't.[11] **Q.** So that was not a true statement, correct?[12] **A.** That is what I believed at the time. I didn't
[13] say I said it --[14] **Q.** What evidence do you have here today that Ron
[15] committed tax fraud?[16] **MR. SOBEL:** Objection. Asked and answered.[17] **THE COURT:** Overruled. You can answer,
[18] because I heard your last answer. But just answer again.
[19] Do you have any evidence?[20] **THE WITNESS:** No.[21] **THE COURT:** All right. Next question.[22] **BY MR. PODUSLENKO:**[23] **Q.** Exhibit Number 91. Is this a text that you sent
[24] to Ron?[25] **A.** Yes.

Page 179

Page 180

[1] **Q.** And it is dated January 20th, correct?[2] **A.** Yes.[3] **Q.** And that would be of 2018?[4] **A.** Yup.[5] **Q.** And please turn to the third page.[6] **A.** Yup.[7] **Q.** Why would you send these texts to Ron, for
[8] example, and say the following -- let me just first ask
[9] you this question, you told Ron on Page 3 of that
[10] document, "You are also going to find out that your wife
[11] conspired with Bruce's brother to have him murdered."

[12] Do you see that?

[13] **A.** Yes.[14] **Q.** And that is not true, right?[15] **A.** It seems as if it might be true.[16] **Q.** Okay. What evidence, sir, do you have here today
[17] that Rima conspired with Bruce's brother to have him
[18] murdered? Evidence.[19] **A.** None.[20] **Q.** Okay. What evidence did you have when you texted
[21] Ron? What evidence did you have that, in fact, Rima
[22] conspired with Bruce's brother to have him murdered?[23] **A.** Firsthand witnesses who were there.[24] **Q.** What evidence did you have, sir?[25] **MR. SOBEL:** Objection.

Page 181

Page 182

[1] **MR. PODUSLENKO:** Not just what people told [2] you.
[3] **MR. SOBEL:** Objection.
[4] **THE COURT:** Overruled.
[5] **BY MR. PODUSLENKO:**
[6] **Q.** What actual evidence did you have that Rima [7] conspired with Bruce's brother to have him murdered?
[8] **A.** None.
[9] **Q.** And then you say, "He didn't die from the line of [10] duty. But lied and had him killed because he was worth a [11] shit load of money death." I presume you meant dead, [12] right?
[13] **A.** I would imagine.
[14] **Q.** You would agree? Not imagine.
[15] **A.** Yes.
[16] **Q.** So what evidence do you have today?
[17] **A.** None.
[18] **Q.** Okay. And what evidence did you have when you [19] wrote this text, sir?
[20] **A.** His son.
[21] **Q.** Pardon me? Whose son?
[22] **A.** Bruce's nephew was --
[23] **Q.** What evidence do you have, sir?
[24] **MR. SOBEL:** Judge, he is trying to answer the [25] question.

Page 183

Page 184

[1] they should have had concern that the DA and FBI were [2] coming after them, correct?
[3] **A.** Absolutely.
[4] **Q.** So you would agree that would be something that [5] would worry someone that you told that to, correct?
[6] **A.** I would hope it would worry someone. It is a [7] worrying thing.
[8] **Q.** Is that why you sent it, so they would worry?
[9] **A.** That is what I believed was still potentially [10] possible.
[11] **Q.** You say potentially possible. Potentially, [12] right?
[13] **MR. SOBEL:** Objection. Is that a question?
[14] **THE COURT:** Yeah. Your question is --
[15] **THE WITNESS:** I absolutely believe that.
[16] **THE COURT:** All right.
[17] **THE WITNESS:** Whole-heartedly.
[18] **BY MR. PODUSLENKO:**
[19] **Q.** Now, take a look at your deposition. In fact, I [20] will just read it to you. Page 201, Lines 1 through 13.
[21] I asked you, "And, in fact, you say he didn't die from the [22] line of duty. But lied and had him killed because he was [23] worth a shit load of money?" And you say, "Yup."
[24] Question, "Okay. So have fun explaining that to [25] the FBI?" Answer, "Yeah." "Why did you tell him to have

[1] **THE COURT:** Just answer the question. --
[2] **MR. PODUSLENKO:** What actual evidence --
[3] **THE COURT:** What evidence do you have?
[4] **THE WITNESS:** None.
[5] **THE COURT:** Thank you. Next question.
[6] **BY MR. PODUSLENKO:**
[7] **Q.** Then you say, "Have fun explaining that to the [8] FBI and the State of Virginia..."
[9] **A.** Can I take a look at that text, please?
[10] **Q.** "Have fun explaining that to the FBI and the [11] state of Virginia district attorney when they come home [12] for both of you."
[13] Do you see that?
[14] **A.** Yes.
[15] **Q.** So you are basically threatening them and mocking [16] them. Hey, have fun when they come.
[17] **A.** I am not threatening.
[18] **THE COURT:** Sir, so your answer is no -- what [19] is your next question, Counsel?
[20] **BY MR. PODUSLENKO:**
[21] **Q.** So that was a matter of fact statement?
[22] **A.** Yeah.
[23] **Q.** Pardon?
[24] **A.** Yeah.
[25] **Q.** So that was such a matter of fact statement that

[1] fun explaining to the FBI?" Answer, "Because at that [2] point in time, I believe the FBI was going to be [3] involved." Question, "But they weren't, were they?"
[4] Answer, "I don't know."
[5] That was your answer at your deposition that you [6] didn't know whether the FBI was, in fact, involved,
[7] correct?
[8] **A.** Wait. If the FBI was involved?
[9] **Q.** Yes.
[10] **A.** Yup.
[11] **Q.** That is what your testimony was, that you didn't [12] know at the time that you made that, that the FBI was [13] involved, correct?
[14] **A.** No. I did believe at the time that statement was [15] made that the FBI was involved.
[16] **Q.** I just read through your deposition transcript.
[17] So --
[18] **A.** I understand.
[19] **Q.** So that wasn't true in your deposition?
[20] **A.** I am honestly a little bit confused as to what [21] you are saying at this point.
[22] **Q.** The question was -- again, let me read it to you.
[23] I said, "But they weren't, were they?" Answer, "I don't [24] know," is what you said.
[25] **A.** Yes.